DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 838 JC 720 082

AUTHOR Hartzog, Arthur Butler
TITLE Guidelines for the Establishment of College Union Organization and Facilities on Certain Types of Two-Year Campuses.
PUB DATE 28 Dec 68
NOTE 80p.; Master's thesis, University of South Carolina

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Educational Facilities; *Facility Guidelines; *Facility Requirements; *Junior Colleges; Masters Theses; *Student Unions; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS *South Carolina

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a set of 20 major guidelines for developing college student union organizations and facilities that may be utilized by 2-year institutions similar to University of South Carolina regional campuses. In justifying these guidelines the author reviews the related literature and the data collection procedures--campus visits and a questionnaire survey--from which these guidelines were prepared. The questionnaire and its statistical results are appended. (AL)

ED 060838

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COLLEGE UNION ORGANIZATION AND FACILITIES ON CERTAIN TYPES OF TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

by

ARTHUR BUTLER HARTZOG

A. B., University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Education Degree
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
December 28, 1968

JC 720 082

Donald H. McKenzie, Ed.D.
Advisor

C. H. Witten
Assistant Professor
of Education
Reader

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 19 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A Master's Paper should not be eighteen months in the making. In some fields of study, the original data would be outdated in that period of time. Thank Heaven the college union field does not move quite that rapidly. The people who work in college unions, however, and the people who work with two-year colleges do move at a rapid pace. Many of these people -- and many others -- gave of their time and energy to be of assistance in the present study. Without their help the time lag would surely have been greater, or there may have been no paper at all. Someone would certainly be omitted if it were attempted to name all who made this study possible. In a few brief paragraphs I hope to express my appreciation to those who gave the invaluable advice, assistance, criticism and simple prodding which brought about the present work.

To my friend, informal teacher, unofficial advisor and patient employer for two years -- Dave Phillips -- I extend the deepest appreciation. As Director of the Student Union at the University of South Carolina, Mr. Phillips made all of his resources and considerable knowledge of the union field available to me whenever I needed it. Another friend, formal teacher, official advisor and also patient employer -- Vice President, C.H. Witten -- has been invaluable throughout my whole course of study. Without his aid, the present paper would probably not have been written at all.

My Graduate Advisor, Dr. Donald McKenzie, often made his time my time. His constant suggestions and criticisms have given the study a sophistication it would not otherwise have had.

Dr. John J. Duffy, Academic Coordinator for the Regional Campuses of the University of South Carolina, readily rendered assistance and helped make arrangements which saved much time and money. John Maxwell, who worked from Dr. Duffy's office, was very patient and helpful in providing transportation for my visits to the regional campuses.

Several union directors took time out from their busy schedules at the Association of College Unions - International Annual Conference in Chicago to be subjects for the pilot study. Members of the Research Committee of that organization later reviewed the questionnaire in detail and offered helpful suggestions.

The most invaluable help came, of course, from the panel of experts who studied and responded to the lengthy and involved questionnaire. The names of these people are listed in Appendix B of the present paper. Without their interest in the study, long months of preparation would have been fruitless.

The Directors and Assistant Directors of the regional campuses made themselves readily available for interviews (sometimes with no prior notice) and were very cooperative in providing needed information.

My fellow graduate students in the union field and other employees of the Student Union often gave of their own time to help in the less glamorous aspects of research, such as printing and collating questionnaires and

stuffing envelopes. The secretary for the Union, Mary Ross Ashby, has been patient in many respects and deserves a special note of appreciation.

Finally, if a Master's Paper can be dedicated, I dedicate this one to my wife Jean, who has spent many hours doing her own work to the accompaniment of a scribbling pen or a stammering typewriter. She has often taken time from teaching school, doing all the housework, and having Arthur B., Jr. to help with the tedious details. For all this, and more, my heartfelt thanks.

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Significance	4
Definition of Terms	7
Scope and Limitations	7
Organization of the Following Chapters	8
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
III. PROCEDURES	18
Rationale	18
Sample Selection	19
Instrument Construction	20
Campus Visitations	22
Collection and Analysis of the Data	23
Summary of Procedures	24
IV. FINDINGS	26
Campus Visitations	26
Questionnaire Results	37
V. SUMMARY, GUIDELINES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	43
Summary of Procedures	43
Guidelines	44
Recommendations	52
APPENDICES	54
A. Cover Letters and Questionnaire, with Statistical Results	55
B. List of Respondents to Questionnaire	68
LIST OF REFERENCES	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The rapidly growing number of two-year institutions of higher learning in the United States has recently been highlighted in many national publications. Of special interest to this paper are those of the Association of College Unions - International. This Association is interested in two-year colleges from the standpoint of services a college union can provide students of these institutions.

A college union (or student union) is usually understood to refer to an organization and a facility or set of facilities. Typically the organization is primarily composed of student volunteers, supervised by a professional staff or director. The relationship of the union to other campus organizations and/or the student government will vary from one college to another. Defining this relationship is part of the task of the present paper. Facilities consist primarily of a building or buildings; size, of course, depends on the number of students expected to use the facilities, while defining what the buildings should house is also one of the aims of the present study. Responsibilities which often devolve on a union staff besides social-cultural programming are maintenance and operation of food service, bookstore, and recreational facilities.

The idea is now widely accepted, especially among student personnel workers, that college students can utilize their extra-curricular time to augment their classroom learning. Indeed, through proper organization of leisure time much can be offered students that is not available in the classroom. In this organization of leisure time, a college union should be of paramount importance to the goals of the institution.

Poor college union operation is often the result of haphazard planning of organization and facilities, or of no planning at all. Student personnel specialists suspect that a common mistake often made is that of trying to farm out union-type activities under unqualified personnel. Often, a student lounge and perhaps a small snack bar are added to an existing building, often in the wrong place, and may be too small or too large. If the wrong kind of programs are planned in the wrong kind of facility, the result easily can be chaos.

In order for a student's spare time to be used constructively, someone should aid in the planning of the places and the ways in which the student's spare time will be spent. John T. Condon, in a talk before the Association of College Unions - International, quoted from the pamphlet "College Center -- Fifty Facts" the following philosophy for the role of a college union (for a two-year as well as a four-year institution):

> The current aims of the (union) (sic) have grown out of the widely held view among educators that what the college does educationally in the hours outside the classroom is of major importance, and that the social cultural program for the student

> body at the (Union) (sic) can give a new dimension to education -- vastly expanding the time area and the means through which the college educates.
>
> As the living room or the hearthstone of the college, the (union) (sic) provides for the services, conveniences, and amenities the members of the college family need in their daily life on the campus, and for getting to know and understand one another through informal association outside the classroom.

The problems that many colleges face may result from improper planning of facilities and organization for union programs. For example, many union buildings are built without adequately considering the needs of the students. When there are several student organizations on a particular campus, they will need office space. Size and location of the offices should be suited to the size, type, and function of the organization. Recreational facilities should be located where they will not interfere with other activities, such as meetings or classes. Social-cultural facilities such as art galleries, theaters, ballrooms, and outdoor patios should be planned when possible, for the total fulfillment of students' needs.

Much improper planning could be avoided by appropriate surveys of students' needs as they relate to the makeup of the student body, the type of community, the type of institution, administrative policy, and available funds. This investigator felt that planning could further be aided by a study of the opinions of experts on college unions, upon which guidelines may be established for union organization and facilities.

The University of South Carolina operates eight regional campuses, or "extensions," in various parts of the state. These regional campuses had an average enrollment of 259 in 1967 and are two-year institutions. The number of students at each campus is certain to increase as South Carolina's economy makes a greater demand for people educated at this type of institution. At present, none of these regional campuses have a college union although one union-type facility (building) does exist. However, all of the campuses are formulating plans for future growth and development. The importance of properly providing for students' needs through union organization and facilities at the present time cannot be overemphasized. Much wasted money, potential, and time can be avoided by a set of proper guidelines which can be used in the planning for the regional campuses.

Statement of the Problem

The problem with which the present paper deals is that of establishing a set of guidelines for development of college union organization and facilities which may be utilized by the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina, and possibly by other similar two-year institutions.

Significance

The present enrollment of junior colleges in the United States is well over one and a half million students, and new junior colleges are opening at a rate of fifty per year.[2] There is little reason to believe that the growth of community colleges (as types of junior colleges) is any less than the overall trend. Enrollment at the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina is growing every year, and

may reach, in the next five to ten years, up to 2,500 students at some campuses. The total enrollment at all of the regional campuses increased from 1,561 to 2,071 from October, 1966 to October, 1967.[3] This increase of 510 is expected to more than double for the present year. Already, new buildings are being constructed for some of the campuses. Two of the campuses have plans for moving to totally new sites.

Clearly, junior colleges are now a vital part of the American system of higher education. The needs of their students for union facilities cannot be ignored. Most junior colleges do not have unions, and many that do are only beginning. Why should the four-year student have more advantages than the two-year one? The latter may even profit more from such facilities than the former, at least in some areas. Students who drive to school from their homes, attend classes, and return home are missing a large part of the total educational experience which should be available to them. The college thus used is only partially fulfilling its potential for educating and training its students.

These are very general reasons that all community colleges, as well as the University of South Carolina regional campuses in particular, may benefit from establishment of college unions on their campuses. The real significance of the present study, however, lies in the establishment of guidelines to aid in <u>proper</u> planning of such facilities and organization. Colleges establishing new unions with no guidelines to aid in their planning may end up with poorly designed, poorly managed, and poorly programmed unions.

The Association of College Unions - International, in a leaflet distributed by the Research Committee[4] has pointed out the need for

research in the area of the union in the two-year college. References are often made to poor union planning, which results in wasted money and wasted opportunity for properly utilizing students' time and leadership potential. At the 1967 Conference, the ACU-I devoted time for several speakers to talk on "The Dynamics of Change" as related to junior college unions. A recent publication of this Association, An Annotated Bibliography of the College Union, by Ernest Martin Christensen,[5] lists at least ten reports, articles, and papers relating to junior college unions.

The administrators at the main campus of the University of South Carolina who are responsible for the regional campuses have also expressed a desire for such a study as the present one, as they feel it will be helpful in their planning. They recognize the need for proper guidelines, based on professional opinions as well as on practical information.

Even if union professionals are not available to aid in the planning of union organization and facilities, then business managers, planning coordinators, other college officials, and interested community citizens who aid in community college planning should benefit from the present study.

The significance of these guidelines should be apparent to anyone interested in the future development of two-year (community) colleges, including the Association of College Unions - International, the American Association of Junior Colleges, the University of South Carolina, union staff members of two-year institutions, boards of trustees, community college administrators, faculty, supporters, parents, and especially the students of such colleges.

Definition of Terms

In order to aid the interpretation of the questions raised and the conclusions drawn in the present paper, certain terms are operationally defined as follows:

A "college union" is a part of the college which provides social, cultural, and recreational programs and facilities for the college family. It is part of the total educational program of the college.

"Community college" is understood to be a two-year institution which usually offers programs for college transfer, terminal vocational and technical training, and adult education; also, all (or most) students live at home in the surrounding community and commute to the college. A community college is usually publicly supported, but may be private or church-supported.

The "regional campuses" of the University of South Carolina are two-year campuses operated by the University, which offer programs for college transfer, terminal vocational and technical training, and adult education. All students commute to classes. These regional campuses are therefore considered to be very similar to the typical "community college" as defined above, with small enrollments at present.

Scope and Limitations

The problems facing successful operation of college unions are many, but proper organization and facilities seem to be the most important areas which should be studied and described. Other important phases of college union development such as management and programming could not be treated separately in the present study, although where these areas directly affect organization or facilities, they were con-

sidered. A study of facilities and organization should provide information of more general value than a study of these other areas of college union operation. The present study is restricted to these two phases of the role of the union within the setting of the South Carolina regional campuses.

As the guidelines produced by the present study should be applicable to the type of two-year institution represented by the eight regional campuses of the University of South Carolina, the special characteristics of this type should be kept in mind (see "Definition of Terms," above). Enrollment is small on the regional campuses -- an average of 259 students at each campus in October of 1967. Experts aiding in the present study were asked to keep in mind that increases in enrollment are expected in the next five to ten years up to an average of 750 students for each campus. (Actually, two campuses predict enrollments of 2,500 in five to ten years.) These enrollment factors could make a difference when the present guidelines are being applied to other institutions.

The scope of the present guidelines is thereby limited to the development of college union organization and facilities on the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina, with possible application to other two-year institutions when certain assumptions and reservations are considered. The reader is also cautioned against too strict adherence to the present guidelines, as they are meant to be general and flexible.

Organization of the Following Chapters

The following chapters will be devoted to a review of the related literature, a description of the procedures used in the present study,

the findings of the study, and the conclusions reached in the form of guidelines. Finally, recommendations for further research will be suggested. Appendices are provided, which include the questionnaire used, the cover letters, and a list of the panel of experts who responded to the instrument.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Existing literature on the subject of college unions in two-year colleges is very sparse. An Annotated Bibliography of the College Union, published by the Association of College Unions - International lists only ten entries relating to this particular type of union.[5] Some of these articles are reviewed below, but not all of those listed in the publication referred to have real relevance to the present study.

A few articles and papers found in various other sources were found to have some bearing on the present subject. Some of these do not deal specifically with college union organization or facilities in the two-year college; rather they describe or investigate certain problems which are of basic importance to the present subject.

One may find evidence in many sources of the phenomenal growth of junior colleges in the United States. The American Association of Junior Colleges estimates that by 1970, three out of every four students entering college will enroll at a junior college.[6] The enrollment of U. S. junior colleges at present exceeds one and a half million students, and fifty new junior colleges are opening each year.[2]

College unions, too, are enjoying a parallel growth with junior colleges.[7] Lyons reports that two-thirds of the existing college unions were built since 1952.[8] According to a report by the U. S. Office of Education, fifty-one new institutions (opening between 1961 and 1965) were providing or were planning to provide campus union facilities. Twenty-nine two-year colleges included a college union building as among the first buildings constructed.[9]

This growth of college unions, especially in two-year institutions, is not commensurate with the needs of the students. Humphreys, in a 1952 study, pointed out that relatively few junior colleges had student personnel programs adequate to meet the needs of their students at that time.[10] Undoubtedly, this is still true. Contributing to the overall problem is the fact that professionally qualified personnel workers are not used in sufficient numbers. There is a tendency for the chief administrator of the institution, or his assistant when there is one, to carry too much responsibility in the student personnel program. Some of the reasons that Humphreys lists for this problem are: a) insufficient financing; b) lack of qualified personnel; and c) lack of physical facilities.

Reinhard focuses on the need for unions in two-year colleges, in order to reverse this inadequacy of student personnel programs. In an article published in the Junior College Journal,[7] he cites the need for establishing unions at junior colleges as a focus of the community population where all members of the college can intermingle. These unions should have dual extracurricular and educational roles of promoting free inquiry, expression and creative thought within the community.

The Association of College Unions - International has seen the need to establish a Committee on Junior Colleges, whose objectives emphasize the need for such guidelines as the present paper provides. These objectives are as follows:

1. To formulate and establish guidelines and principles regarding the role of the campus union in the junior colleges.

2. To develop closer liaison between college unions in four-year institutions and those found on two-year campuses.

3. To encourage and assist in professional development in the staffing and operation of junior or community college unions.

4. To assist college union personnel in the two-year institutions in developing an image of the union as an integral part of higher education.[11]

Meeting some of the needs of modern-day students is often not an easy task. Even if the college is willing and financially able, there are certain problems which should be foreseen. Zissis,[12] in an article on changes in activities programs, says that the makeup of present-day student bodies and their social habits have caused changes in organized student activities. There are more older, married students, more students work part-time, commute, come from lower income families, and change from college to college. There is often faculty apathy for organized activities. In general, she finds that students spend more of their time in academic rather than extracurricular pursuits. Socially, students prefer small groups to large. Their interests call for plays, lectures, and music, film and art events rather than purely social events such as dances and parties. The staffs which guide student activities programs are often not well-trained.

It is precisely these kinds of problems that should be considered in organizing and providing facilities for a two-year college union. Medsker[13] found three factors which make student personnel problems more difficult for community colleges: 1) the limited span of college years in the same institution, 2) the consequent absence of the more mature students in the upper division, 3) the tendency of students living at home to retain their identity with their families and establish peer circles rather than to develop a relationship with new associates.

Nelson[14] recognizes some of the particular means by which unions may cope with the needs of commuting students. Commuters need lounge, recreational and eating facilities more than do residence students. The time of day that programs should be offered is different -- mornings and afternoons rather than evenings. Some problems faced by college unions on all-commuter campuses according to this article are: 1) learning from the students what kinds of programs they want; 2) finding space for informal programs where students with similar interests may meet; and 3) getting commuters to actively participate in campus life.

There is a definite need for the proper planning of facilities and organization, as Reinhard states in the introduction to his doctoral thesis on the role of unions in the two-year college.[15] He points out that many institutions haphazardly add phases of the program without duly considering the needs of the over-all college community.

The results of a panel discussion published by the School Planning Laboratory[16] provide some helpful views on planning a student center for the community college. Factors which should be considered are relationships between required spaces, traffic patterns, functions, and utilities needed. The role of the architect is considered, emphasizing the concern with the human factor in the design of a building. Attention is focused on the psychological and sociological factors involved. The student center is a place where students continue their educational experiences. "In planning a student center consideration should be given to the student, his outlook, his basic concerns, and his relationship with other people." The educational concerns of the community were also mentioned. Planning ahead for increased enrollments was discussed as an important factor in

building student centers. Campuses are most often "dessicated and butchered" when unplanned expansion takes place.

Reeve,[17] at the 1966 Association of College Unions - International Conference, stated that commuting students are hurt by the present tendency to concentrate on faculty, classroom space, and equipment before improving the educational environment of the school. He feels that time is important to commuting students -- the union should provide their food services, lounge facilities, transportation services, and personal services.

As a result of a survey of student centers in New York State Community Colleges, Murphy[18] found the average floor space in the student centers to be 23.4 square feet per student. He recommends more meeting rooms and student office space. It is not so much the size of the building that matters, as the kind of facilities provided; especially useful to programming were found to be recreational and cultural facilities. Planning should be made for multi-purpose use of areas such as dining halls and auditoriums. One person should be responsible for the student center, rather than having several people responsible for different aspects of the same building.

Condon[1] maintains that the "student union" concept can be as effective on the two-year campus as on a four-year college campus. Certain conditions which characterize community colleges make it difficult, but union functions do exist on such campuses and are thought desirable for the "full college life." Finding that an administrative rationale concerning college unions has yet to be stated for community colleges, Dean Condon made several proposals, which indicate that a well-planned

union with a working philosophy similar to that of a four-year college union can work. A union can make such things as cocurricular activities, student government, recreational facilities and programs, food services, social life, and the bookstore more a part of the college life. Administrative responsibility for the union should reside in one office, such as Dean of Student Activities or a Director of Student Union Activities, such a full-time position is warranted even in the smallest community college. Proposals were also made by Dean Condon concerning relationship of the union and student senate, the union building, and financing union functions.

Reinhard's 1964 doctoral study[15] provides some of the most relevant data to the present study that could be found in the literature. A portion of his findings and conclusions are further reviewed here because of their special relevance.

In his study covering most of the members of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Dr. Reinhard found that public two-year institutions were more likely to have a union than private or independent colleges. Union staffs at the responding institutions were small in number. Facilities most often provided by two-year college unions were: lounge area, snack bar, and meeting rooms, most also had a cafeteria or dining room, student offices and storage space for student organizations.

Two-year unions were not involved very much in sponsoring and promoting programs and activities -- student organizations did this. These unions felt more successful in serving as the community center, or "hearthstone" of the campus than in fulfillment of any other purpose of a union. Lack of student responsibility and maturity were the two main problems in developing campus union programs in the two-year college.

Conclusions from the study were that more than one-third of responding institutions had existing unions, and another third were planning or constructing union facilities. Public junior colleges are probably better able financially to build unions. Two-year college unions are more of a facility than a programming agency. They should become more deeply involved in programming in order to become part of the total educational process. The differences between two and four-year unions should be recognized -- concern with needs of the local community, fewer weekend programs, less concern for perfection in programming, fewer professional staff members, and greater diversification of staff. Two-year college unions should call upon local resources to assist in the development of a worthwhile program.

Finally, two of Reinhard's recommendations give support to the present study: 1) that the Association of College Unions and other related associations should adopt a statement of purpose and guidelines regarding the role of the campus union in the two-year institution; and 2) that additional research is needed in the area of unions in two-year colleges.

Several other sources are recommended as helpful in planning unions, although they do not deal specifically with unions in the two-year college. One of these is a booklet titled Premises: Planning Student Personnel Facilities,[19] which deals with functions and relationships between student personnel and other parts of the college.

A second source is a recent section of College and University Business[20] (October, 1967), which is a planning guide for community colleges.

A good source for a brief description of the history, purposes, goals and planning aids for college unions is an article by Porter Butts, Editor of Publications for ACU-I. "The College Union Story"[21] is oriented toward four-year institutions, but can be informative for any type of union planner. The list of union planning references at the end of the article is very helpful.

A wide variety of sources was reviewed in this chapter as having some relevance for the present study. It can be seen, however, that actually few sources are available which shed direct light on planning for union organization and facilities at two-year community colleges. Rather than cite only those few sources, an attempt was made to outline the problems, needs and proposed solutions concerning two-year college unions in general which are available in recent literature.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Rationale

It seemed reasonable to assume that a number of experts were available who have a good knowledge of what a college union on a two-year campus should be. It was believed that these experts could be directors of four-year unions, as well as those in charge of well-established or well-planned two-year unions. Persons who have done studies of the union in the two-year college were considered to have valuable knowledge that could be tapped. Certain student personnel educators were seen as a resource for needed information. These three groups of people -- directors of exemplary unions at two-year colleges, selected directors of unions in four-year institutions, and knowledgeable student personnel educators -- were seen as a source for a panel of experts who could provide information to be used as guidelines.

Since these experts are located in various parts of the country, a questionnaire seemed to be the most practical method of collecting the needed information. Such an instrument also seemed most desirable since a consensus of opinions was desired, as well as some way to obtain specific responses to specific questions. The proximity of the eight regional campuses made visits and interviews at these institutions possible, which provided a background for interpreting the data so that it would be useful for these particular campuses.

Establishing useful guidelines from any type of data is difficult. What seems useful or effective in one situation is very often not useful in a different set of circumstances. The regional campuses for which the guidelines are to be used vary widely in many respects, as do all such institutions. The present study was designed so that general findings could be made available, while allowing flexibility in application of the resulting guidelines. This design seemed rational, comprehensive, and economical.

A completely objective method for deriving guidelines is difficult to achieve. The subjective nature of drawing inferences from data is unavoidable, however objective the data may be. The questions in the instrument may have been interpreted differently by different respondents as well as by the investigator. The end result certainly reflects some biases. An attempt was made to remain as objective as possible, both in constructing the instrument and in interpreting the results.

Sample Selection

A seven-page questionnaire, along with a cover letter from the Vice-President for Student Affairs of the University of South Carolina and a cover letter from the investigator, were sent to each of a total of sixty-seven individuals. These subjects were selected with the help of a number of people who are familiar with student personnel services in junior colleges. The Association of College Unions - International, the American Association of Junior Colleges, presidents of state associations of junior colleges, chairmen of educational committees concerned with personnel services in two-year colleges, well-known college union directors, student personnel educators at the University of South

Carolina, and state departments of education were called upon to suggest individuals who could be included in the sample of experts. Three main categories of people were considered in drawing up the sample. The first was a "general" category, consisting of individuals who held positions with various associations concerned with student personnel services, writers of articles and textbooks, union directors at four-year institutions, and those who have done special studies in the area of college unions in the two-year college. The second group consisted of student personnel educators (necessarily, of course, at graduate institutions). The third category, and the largest, was that of persons directly in charge of unions (or student activities, where actual unions do not yet exist) in two-year colleges. These people in the third category were selected on the basis of experience in actual work and/or planning of college unions and student activities at two-year institutions. In one or two cases, there was an overlap among categories (i.e., an author in the "general" group was also a student personnel educator, and a student personnel educator is now a college union director at a two-year college). Geographical distribution was attempted, but the primary emphasis in selection of subjects was their knowledge of the union in the two-year college. Seventeen states and the District of Columbia were represented in the sample. Table 1 shows this distribution, with the number sent and the number responding. A list of individuals who responded is given in Appendix B.

Instrument Construction

The questionnaire was designed by the investigator, utilizing several available sources. Many of the questions were suggested by experts with several years' experience in student personnel work. A

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY STATES

State	Number Mailed	Number Returned
Arizona	1	0
California	8	5
District of Columbia	1	1
Florida	14	13
Georgia	1	1
Idaho	1	1
Illinois	4	2
Indiana	2	2
Kentucky	1	1
Maryland	1	1
Massachussetts	2	2
Michigan	2	2
New York	7	3
North Carolina	5	5
Ohio	2	2
Pennsylvania	5	3
Texas	7	5
Wisconsin	2	2
	67	50[a]

[a]Results are based on 49 questionnaires because one was discarded due to insufficient data.

pilot study was conducted at the Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions - International in Chicago in April, 1968. The questionnaire was further reviewed by the Research Committee of the Association of College Unions in June, 1968. Suggestions from these two reviews of the questionnaire were incorporated in the final version of the instrument. On the first page of the instrument a summary description of the major characteristics of the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina was given. This information was obtained from printed material distributed by the University, the Directory of the American Association of Junior Colleges, and from conversations with various officials concerned with the regional campuses. The questionnaire, along with the cover letters, is reprinted as Appendix A.

Following the description of the regional campuses, the instrument was divided into two sections: I, Organization; and II, Facilities. All questions were multiple-choice, some requiring only one response, others allowing more than one response. Several of the items also required that percentages be written in the blanks by chosen responses, and some others required a 1, 2, or 3 rating of items. There was space for comments at the end of each section of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to fill in their name, title, and business address at the end of the questionnaire, and there was a blank to check if a summary of the results was desired.

Campus Visitations

Prior to gathering the data, the investigator visited each regional campus, and talked to the Director or Assistant Director at each. Questions were asked about existing student personnel services, programs, and facil-

ities, and the possibilities for a union organization on the respective campuses. This was done so that the investigator might have a background against which to interpret the data and to construct useful guidelines.

Collection and Analysis of the Data

Of the total of 67 questionnaires sent, 50 were returned, for a return percentage of 74.6%. Some of the subjects were apparently away from their usual work, either on vacation or at temporary summer assignments. The investigator feels that this was the primary reason for some questionnaires not being returned. Since the individuals who were sent questionnaires were not actually a sample of any real population, the investigator considered the return or almost three-fourths of the questionnaires extremely adequate for the type of information desired. Although several of the respondents left some of the items incomplete, the nature of the instrument did not dictate that these incomplete questionnaires be discarded. One returned questionnaire was discarded, however, since the respondent apparently misunderstood the directions and information given. Thus results are based on the data from forty-nine of the questionnaires, or 73.1% of the total sample. The responses were recorded on computer data collection forms, and each respondent was identified by a separate identification number. In the analysis of the data, the investigator used the number and percent of the total responses for each item in the questionnaire. In cases where responses consisted of percentages, the averages of responses was used. It is for this reason that incomplete questionnaires could be used, since the analysis simply reveals a smaller number of responses to certain questions.

The information obtained from the regional campus visitations was used as a background for interpreting the questionnaire data so that the guidelines would more nearly fulfill the needs of the regional campuses. A summary of each visit is given in Chapter IV, Tables 2 through 9.

Patterns of majority and minority attitudes were revealed by the analysis of the data in the manner described above, which were studied and arranged into a sequence of guidelines in the concluding chapter of the present paper.

Summary of Procedures

The procedures followed in drawing up the guidelines were as follows: It was assumed that the opinions of a panel of experts in the field of college unions in two-year colleges could be used as the basis of the proposed guidelines. These experts were selected with the aid of a number of agencies and individuals. A questionnaire was used to collect the desired information from the list of subjects. This instrument was carefully developed (again with the aid of various committees and individuals), a pilot study was conducted, the questionnaire finally revised and mailed to the selected individuals. The questions were related to the two areas seen as most important in the development of college unions -- organization and facilities. The questions were preceded by a general description of the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina, which was to serve as a background against which the experts could respond to the items.

The investigator visited seven of the eight regional campuses and interviewed the director or assistant director at each. Information

obtained as a result of these interviews was used as an aid in determining some of the needs that the guidelines should fulfill.

The pattern of responses to each item in the questionnaire was tabulated so that the consensus of opinions could be observed. These patterns were then incorporated into guidelines for effective development of college union organization and facilities on the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina, and possibly for similar two-year institutions.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Campus Visitations

Seven of the eight regional campuses were visited by the investigator in order to determine the kinds of facilities and organization that presently exist. The investigator talked with the Director or Assistant Director of each campus, and asked a series of questions concerning:

A) Present extracurricular facilities

B) Enrollment

C) Activities

D) Students' leisure time

E) Maximum commuting distance

F) Planned facilities

G) Practicality of a college union organization for the particular campus concerned.

(The Director of the eighth campus was contacted by telephone.) A summary of the information obtained from each campus is outlined in Tables 2 through 9.

TABLE 2

DESCRIPTION OF REGIONAL CAMPUS #1
(One multipurpose building)

A. Present extracurricular facillities:

1. A general lounge, located in the main entrance of the one campus building.
2. A faculty lounge near faculty offices, which students feel free to visit.
3. A work room for student organizations.

B. Enrollment (full-time):

1. Present: 160
2. Predicted:
   a) 1968-69: 180-190
   b) in five to ten years: 300-500

C. Activities:

1. Yearbook -- student staff contributes a section to one composite book for all campuses.
2. Newspaper -- student staff publishes monthly.
3. Student council -- organizes dances for the student body.
4. Administration arranges for lectures and art shows, throughout the year.
5. Intramural basketball.

D. Students' leisure time: Spent chiefly at nearby drive-ins and restaurants; some time spent in the lounge between classes.

E. Maximum commuting distance: 40 miles.

F. Planned facilities:

1. Gymnasium -- a prefabricated structure to be completed sixty days from beginning of construction. To include:
   a) student lounge
   b) vending area
   c) table tennis tables
   d) possibly a billiard table.
   The floor will be used for dances as well as athletics and general physical recreation.

G. Possibilities for a union organization: The Assistant Director feels that a union organization (possibly as a committee of the student council) might work at this campus; that there could be enough student leadership and programming to justify this kind of organization.

TABLE 3

DESCRIPTION OF REGIONAL CAMPUS #2[a]
(One modern multipurpose building)

A. Present extracurricular facilities:

1. A canteen with vending machines, a juke box, and tables and chairs.
2. A visitors' lounge.

B. Enrollment (full-time):

1. Present: 400
2. In five to ten years: 1,000

C. Activities:

1. Yearbook - staff contributes to the composite regional campus yearbook.
2. Newspaper -- published by students monthly. (Staffs for the two publications are elected by the student body.)
3. Student council -- sponsors dances, lectures, etc.; has a faculty sponsor.
4. Intramural basketball.

D. Students' leisure time: Primarily spent in canteen between classes.

E. Maximum commuting distance: 40 miles (some students commute from a neighboring state).

F. Planned facilities:

1. A "general educational building" (under construction). Will house:
   a) the office of Director of Admissions
   b) six classrooms
   c) snack bar
   d) kitchen
   e) lounge with color television, stereo, and billiard tables. This lounge can be converted by use of folding partitions into dance space or lecture rooms.

G. Possibilities for a union organization: Not determined.

---

[a]Director interviewed by telephone after the investigator visited the campus.

TABLE 4

DESCRIPTION OF REGIONAL CAMPUS #3

(A remodeled home, serving as the administration building, a brick library-classroom building, and small student center building.)

A. Present extracurricular facilities:

1. Student center -- a small prefabricated building. Consists of three sections:
   a) snack bar in center wing
   b) lounge with television
   c) dining area, with bulletin boards, juke box and "pin ball" machine.
2. A work room in the classroom building, with two desks, a typewriter, filing cabinet and storage space (for the publications).
   (Note: No dance facilities are on campus or very near the campus, and when functions are held off-campus, participation is light.)

B. Enrollment (full-time):

1. Present: 500
2. In five years: 2,500

C. Activities:

1. Student council -- responsibility for honor system, dances, other social functions, cultural events, student-faculty relations, intramurals, and athletics.
2. Yearbook -- students contribute to the composite yearbook for most of the campuses.
3. Newspaper -- students publish monthly.
4. Intramural basketball.

D. Students' leisure time: Much time spent in the student center, but many students listen to radios and tapes in their cars.

E. Maximum commuting distance: 50 miles.

F. Planned facilities:

1. library
2. science building
3. physical education building

G. Possibilities for a union organization: The Director feels that proper facilities are needed before a union organization could operate successfully on this campus.

TABLE 5

DESCRIPTION OF REGIONAL CAMPUS #4

(One multipurpose building and a student center, both recently constructed.)

A. Present extracurricular facilities:

1. "Student union building" -- relatively new, one-story, brick. Contains the following:
   a) entrance lobby
   b) campus shop (sells paperbacks, mugs, sweatshirts, etc.)
   c) large lecture hall - auditorium
   d) language laboratory
   e) faculty office
   f) plush television lounge with color television
   g) snack bar, which serves a hot lunch
   h) dining room (sometimes converted to a dance floor)
   i) work room for the student publications
   j) patio.

   (Organizations hold meetings in classrooms.)
2. An athletic field -- within walking distance of campus; shared with local high school. Provided are a track, football field, and softball diamond.
3. An activities bus, used to transport nursing students to nearby facilities, and to carry athletic teams to other schools.

B. Enrollment (full-time):

1. Present: 300
2. In five to ten years: 800

C. Activities:

1. Student council -- sponsors dances, directs other student activities.
2. Yearbook -- student staff intends to publish a separate annual, rather than a section of the composite regional campus yearbook.
3. Newspaper -- students publish several issues yearly.
4. Intramural sports, including basketball, football and softball.
5. A local town society promotes lectures, plays, art shows, and all cultural events.

D. Students' leisure time: Majority spent in "student union building."

E. Maximum commuting distance: 40 miles.

TABLE 5 (Cont'd)

F. Planned facilities:

1. gymnasium
2. tennis courts

G. Possibilities for a union organization: According to the Assistant Director, who coordinates student affairs, this campus has a college union in fact, but not in name. An actual union organization would work.

TABLE 6

DESCRIPTION OF REGIONAL CAMPUS #5
(One multipurpose building)

A. Present extracurricular facilities:

1. A student lounge, which provides:
   a) a juke box
   b) tables
   c) a television
   d) a billiard table
   e) chess and cards
   (Note: No space is available on campus for dances or parties, but local facilities are convenient for use.)

B. Enrollment (full-time):

1. Present: 130
2. In ten years: 200 (if present trends continue)

C. Activities:

1. Student council -- appoints student members to faculty-student committees on:
   a) dances
   b) cultural programs
   c) chapel programs
   d) athletic events
   (This council usually meets with no faculty present.)
2. Sociology club -- meets periodically for open discussions.
3. Yearbook -- student staff contributes to the composite yearbook.
4. Newspaper -- issued monthly by the students.
5. Intramural basketball.

D. Students' leisure time: Much spent in the student lounge, but some time is also spent at local drive-ins, since no snacks other than soft drinks are available on campus.

E. Maximum commuting distance: 45 miles.

F. Planned facilities:

1. gymnasium -- prefabricated, similar to the one planned for Campus #1.
2. library.

G. Possibilities for a union organization: The Director feels that a union organization would not work on this campus because of the small student body and lack of proper facilities.

TABLE 7

DESCRIPTION OF REGIONAL CAMPUS #6
(A large old home and several mobile classroom units.)

A. Present extracurricular facilities:

1. A ballroom -- used for dances, parties and art shows; also serves as a general lounge during the day.
2. A student lounge -- in the basement; this lounge is small, but provides:
   a) a juke box
   b) vending machines for drinks and sandwiches
   c) a billiard table
   d) tables and chairs
   e) booths
3. Office space for the student council.

B. Enrollment (full-time):

1. Present: 400
2. In ten years: 700 - 750

C. Activities:

1. Student Activities Committee -- all faculty; advises all student organizations.
2. Student council -- sponsors dances.
3. Cultural Committee -- faculty and students; sponsors art shows, chamber music concerts, lectures, etc.
4. Yearbook -- student staff publishes a separate yearbook.
5. Newspaper -- issued monthly by a student staff. (Both publications use the journalism instructor's office when space is needed.)

D. Students' leisure time: Some spent in the lounge, but many students leave campus for drive-ins for hot snacks or lunches.

E. Maximum commuting distance: 30 miles.

F. Planned facilities:

1. A new campus site is to be built in the near future. The new campus will consist of:
   a) a general educational building
   b) a student center, with lounges and recreation areas.

G. Possibilities for a union organization: The Assistant Director, who is primarily responsible for student activities, feels that a lack of student leadership would hamper the success of a union organization for this campus, but that if proper leaders do develop, such an organization might work through the student council.

TABLE 8

DESCRIPTION OF REGIONAL CAMPUS #7

(One relatively new classroom building
and an older administrative building)

A. Present extracurricular facilities:

1. Student lounge -- located in the administrative building; provides television only; meetings are also held here.
(Note: Outside facilities are used for parties, dances and athletic events.)
(Note: Vending machines for cold drinks and snacks are provided in the hallway of the classroom building.)

B. Enrollment (full-time):

1. Present: 200
2. In five to ten years: 300 - 350

C. Activities:

1. Student council -- sponsors dances and lectures.
2. Yearbook -- student staff contributes to composite yearbook for several of the campuses. The typing classroom is used when typing needs to be done.
3. No newspaper is published, although there has been one in the past.
4. Intramural basketball.
(Note: The Director of this campus pointed out that many students at this campus are in the military, and thus do not have as much time or interest for extracurricular activities.)

D. Students' leisure time: Most often spent in the lounge, although the military students usually have jobs which take up their time out of class.

E. Maximum commuting distance: 50 miles.

F. Planned facilities:

1. A new wing to classroom building, for more labs and enlarging the library.

G. Possibilities for a union organization: The Director feels that a union may work if students' interest could be aroused, but at present there is little interest in student activities. As a result, the Director feels it is better for the administration to handle most student activities.

TABLE 9

DESCRIPTION OF REGIONAL CAMPUS #8[a]

(Newly opened campus; one general building and a library; both temporary.)

A. Present extracurricular facilities:

1. A student lounge -- located next to classrooms; provides vending machines for hot or cold sandwiches and drinks, and tables and chairs. No television or juke box are provided because of proximity to classrooms.
2. A study room -- in the library building.
3. Offices for the student publications.
4. A darkroom for the publications and a new photography club.
(Note: No recreational facilities are provided, although arrangements are made with a nearby bowling establishment for intramural play in the mornings when business is ordinarily slack.)

B. Enrollment (full-time):

1. Present (second year of operation): 500 - 525
2. In five years: 2,000 (this campus is located in a high population area.)

C. Activities:

1. Student government association -- sponsors dances, parties, and picnics.
2. Educational Programs Committee -- four faculty and three student members; plans the "convocation series" for each year, which is the cultural program (art shows, lectures, music, plays, etc.).
3. Yearbook -- will be separate from the other campuses.
4. Newspaper -- students publish eight times a year.
(Note: Both publications share a faculty advisor.)
5. Photography club.
6. Cheerleaders' club.
7. Athletics:
   a) basketball team
   b) golf team
   c) tennis team.

   Note: This campus is unique in that some of its nursing students live in a dormitory which is shared with a nearby hospital. A dorm council has been set up by the regional campus, with a social program for the residents.)

---

[a]The Director of this campus was interviewed by telephone. The campus was not visited by the investigator.

TABLE 9 (Cont'd)

D. Students' leisure time: Spent in the student lounge, library, or study room. Students do not usually leave campus, because of a parking problem.

E. Maximum commuting distance: Not determined.

F. Planned facilities:

1. (Among other buildings) a classroom building which will house a student lounge with:
   a) vending machines
   b) telephone
   c) lounge furniture.
   (Note: No music or television will be provided because of nearby classes.)

G. Possibilities for a union organization: The Director feels that a college union would work, but pointed out that commuter students often do not stay on campus after classes long enough to participate in activities.

Questionnaire Results

Sixty-seven questionnaires were originally mailed, and 50 (74.6%) were returned. One of these was discarded by the investigator because the respondent obviously misunderstood the information given. The number used in the tally of responses was actually 49, or 73.1% of the total sample.

A tabulation of the responses to the questionnaire is included in the Sample Questionnaire, Appendix A. The number and percentage of responses to each item is shown to the left of the response blanks. The percentages are based on the number of responses for each question -- not necessarily on the total of 49. Although there are 49 responses to most of the questions, some of them show a lesser total. This is due to either of two circumstances: 1) some items were optional, depending on a previous response, and 2) some items were omitted by respondents. The number of omissions do not significantly affect the pattern of results.

Rather than verbally describing the responses to each item, only unusual or unclear responses are explained in this section of the paper. The data in Appendix A is self-explanatory in most cases.

Part I of the instrument consists of items relative to college union organization at the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina. (The responses to all of the items in the questionnaire are based on a general description of the regional campuses given on the first page of the instrument.)

It should be noted that after the first question, which concerned the advisability of an organized college union on the regional campuses,

the directions indicated that the remaining questions were to be answered as if unions are being planned for these campuses. This was necessary in order to achieve realistic recommendations for such unions.

Some discrepancies in numbers may be noted in a few of the responses, such as in items three and five. These should have been answered only by those responding in a certain way to the preceding questions. There are one too many responses to each of these items. It also should be noted that for all questions of this type where only part of the panel was required to respond, percentages are based only on the number responding. Thus, the 87% who checked a to #3 indicates 87% of the thirty experts who responded to that question.

Two respondents (7%) checked "other" for item 3. Both of these explained this as a choice for a and b -- autonomy in planning and programming for satellite unions, but as a direct extension of the main campus union.

The fifth question asked who the administrator of each regional campus union should be (if not a full-time union director). Although 56% chose b (another administrator or faculty member who devotes part-time to union administration), 33% marked d (other). These six responses were explained as follows: coordinator of student activities; part-time member of the student personnel staff; two for student activities director, union director with additional duties; and either a or b.

The sixth question concerned to whom a full-time union director at the regional campuses should be responsible. The nine (28%) who checked c (other) had varied explanations. Four of these wrote in a and b (combination); three wrote "Dean of Students"; one wrote "students"; and one

wrote "to the Director of the main campus union through the director of the regional campus."

Responses to items 8 d and e required specific types of committees or boards to be written in, indicating how the chief student officer of the union should be chosen. The 17 responses to d were all different; most indicated a type of union committee such as "existing union board" or "union director and programming board"; some responses indicated student government involvement, as "student government with approval of director." Only three of the 11 responses to e specified the type of outgoing board. They were : programming board; governing (policy board; and executive committee of student government.

The percentages shown for items 10.A. and 11.A. are the averages of responses for each particular selection. For example, subject 1 indicated 20% for 10.A. a; subject 2 indicated 30%, and so on. Omissions were counted as zero percent, since an omission was to indicate exclusion of the group concerned. The result for item a is 10%, or the average of the responses (in percentages) given.

Some difficulty was experienced by the investigator in evaluating responses to questions 10 and 11. Choices of 100% had to be coded as 99%, due to computer limitations; one subject indicated zero for all choices to 11.A. and B., stating "not important"; another omitted percentages and wrote in "at least one of each and many students" for 10.A. and 11.A; and one wrote "one combined board" for both 10.B. and 11.B. But other than these limitations, meaningful data was available for computation. Responses were rounded to the nearest percent when necessary. The discrepancies were handled in such a manner that their effect on the

resulting average percentages is negligible. It should be noted that only a general idea of suggested proportions was the goal of the investigator. With these rather fine computations, the results should be a valid indication of at least the general relationships.

For choice f (other means) to item 10.B., there were 22 responses (56%). These were variously worded, but the general intent seems to be for each category of members suggested in item 10.A. to be chosen by some means from among themselves. Suggestions were made, however, for several specific combinations: b and c; a and c; d and e; a, b, c and alumni by alumni; and three suggestions for c and d. The choice of c (appointed by a school official other than the union director) was the most common among these combinations.

Some of the same problems were encountered with the responses to item 11.A. as with 10.A., and the same procedures for dealing with them were used. The 22 responses (52%) of f (other) for item 11.B. were also varied in nature. The pattern was very similar to that for item 10.B.; i.e., each type of membership choosing their own representatives, and a more common choice for c among specific combinations.

An error was made in the investigator's instructions for item 12; respondents should have been instructed to check only one response. When more than one choice were checked they are shown in Appendix A as choice d (some combination). This choice for a combination received 73% of the responses for the question concerning who should physically carry out union-sponsored programs. Of these 35 responses, 19 were for a, b and c; 10 were for b and c; and six for other combinations. The four choices for e (other) included maintenance personnel, program board,

and student service clubs all in various combinations with a through d.

The nine choices for "other" in item 13, concerning sources of operating funds for the union were: state support; two for university subsidy; any source available; local tax funds; rental fees; student service fees; community chest; and community use fees.

Only four similar suggestions were given for item 14, dealing with sources for programming funds: university subsidy; any source available; local tax funds; and community chest.

Item 16 was to provide an indication of how students would be involved in planning the union programming budget. Sixty-one percent checked c (other). Of these 30 responses, 23 were for a and b combined; the other seven were for a and/or b in combination with other boards (student government committees, finance board, etc.).

The seventeenth item asked who should approve the programming budget request before it is sent to the final approval authority for the institution. Twenty-three of the experts (47%) specified "other." Most of these were explained as various combinations of a through c. The most commonly suggested was a, b and c (five); next most frequent was a and c (four); six of the remaining suggestions included the Dean of Students; and two stated that the program board is the final authority.

Twenty-three of the panelists had suggestions for "other" in item 18. The pattern was not quite the same as for item 17. This question concerned approval of expenditures during the year; various combinations of the given choices were suggested. Choice d (union director) was most frequently included in these suggestions: six listed c and d; six others listed a and d; other suggestions primarily concerned d in combination with the Dean of Students or certain student committee members.

Part II of the questionnaire was concerned with union facilities for the regional campuses. After the first two questions the respondents were instructed to proceed as if union buildings are being planned for the regional campuses.

The second question, asking where union facilities should be located if a separate building is not possible, received six responses for a combination of the given choices: three were for a, b and c; one for a and b; one for b and c; and one for "all available space." For the same question, 17 (38%) specified other choices (e). The library was listed four times, the cafeteria twice. Other suggestions were: recreation or services building; bookstore area; student personnel building; auditorium-gymnasium; local store; a portable building; a multi-purpose building; wherever possible; and anywhere but a through d.

The fourth question in Part II asked for a rating of desirability for a list of union facilities. There were seven suggestions for other facilities. The four (not a significant figure) which received a 3-rating (necessary) were Coffee House, campus security, faculty lounge; and computer assistants' instructional facility. A counseling office, storage, publicity room supplies, work room, and health clinic comprised the remaining three suggestions.

Item 6 indicates two suggestions for other facilities in gamerooms. These two are dominoes and a juke box.

In item 7, dealing with a craft shop, the one response for "other" was explained with the statement that c (ceramics) should be available only in connection with an art facility.

Since item 11.B. allowed respondents to check more than one choice, percentages are based on 49 possible responses for each choice, rather than on a total for the entire item.

CHAPTER V

Summary of Procedures

The investigator felt that the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina may have a need for the services of college unions. If it could be determined that such a need exists, then it also was felt that it would be useful to provide guidelines for the proper organization and facilities for unions on these campuses. This seemed especially necessary, since college unions on the regional campuses would have a different environment and face different problems than unions at four-year institutions. Further, the investigator felt that these guidelines could be of some value to two-year colleges similar to the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina.

It was assumed that the opinions of a panel of experts could be used to determine the need for unions at the regional campuses, and as a basis for the proposed guidelines. These experts in the field of college unions at two-year colleges were selected with the aid of a number of agencies and individuals who are also knowledgeable in the field.

A questionnaire was designed by the investigator, who drew on several available sources. The instrument was composed of two parts, relating to union organization and facilities, respectively. These areas were felt to be basic to the development of new college unions. The questions were preceded by a general description of the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina, as a basis for responses to the items. A pilot study was conducted at the Association of

College Unions - International Annual Conference in the spring of 1968, and the questionnaire further revised as the result of a review by the Research Committee of the ACU-I.

Seven of the eight regional campuses were visited by the investigator. Comparative data obtained on these visits is included in the present paper. The main purpose for these visits was to provide the investigator with an aid in developing appropriate guidelines based on the questionnaire responses.

The responses to each item in the questionnaire were tabulated so that the consensus of opinions could be observed. Then basic guidelines for the effective development of college union organization and facilities on the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina were formed from the pattern of results.

Guidelines

Based on the findings produced by the questionnaire results and by the visits to the regional campuses, the following guidelines are presented as a source of information for those who may be interested in establishing college unions at the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina, or at certain types of two-year institutions. The investigator feels that these recommendations are a valid interpretation of the opinions of 49 experts in the area of two-year college unions.

Readers should be cautioned against too general an application of the present guidelines. The panel of experts was asked to base its responses to the questionnaire on a general description of the regional

campuses of the University of South Carolina. The investigator feels that these campuses are similar to many two-year colleges in the United States in the basic characteristics of size, student body, administration, and physical facilities. The guidelines produced by this study may therefore be helpful aids to those persons responsible for establishing college unions at similar institutions.

I. Organization:

GUIDELINE 1. An organized college union which provides social, cultural, and recreational programs and facilities would be more desirable than simply having the college provide a student center (building) with no centrally administered program and facilities (81%, item 1).

GUIDELINE 2. These campus unions should be operated as "satellites" of the main campus union (60%, item 2). However, this connection should be as part of a department of college unions, with much autonomy in planning and programming (87%, item 3).

GUIDELINE 3. There should be a full-time union director (or manager) for each campus (65%, item 4). He should be responsible to the director of the regional campus (66%, plus five of the "other" responses, item 6). If there is not a full-time union director, the administrator of the campus union should be an administrator (other than the director of the campus) or faculty member who devotes part-time to union administration (56%, plus some of the explanations for "other," item 5).

GUIDELINE 4. The union organization should be a committee or sub-organization of the local student government (63%, item 7). (As a result of his visits to the regional campuses, the investigator feels that this is a debatable point. The student councils are barely functional at some of the campuses. On the other hand, the addition of an organized union program as a function of the student councils might revitalize the councils.)

GUIDELINE 5. The chief student officer of the union should be selected by a union committee or board, probably the programming board (58%, item 8 d and e). (NOTE: Results of the eighth question, concerning how the chief student officer of the union should be chosen, were difficult to interpret. Thirty-one percent of the respondents felt he should be elected by the student body, 35% chose selection by an existing union committee, and 23% chose selection by an outgoing union board. The majority -- a total of 58%, combining the latter two choices, feel that selection by a committee or board is best.)

GUIDELINE 6. The union organization should consist of a policy-making and a programming board (78%, item 9). The policy board generally should consist of:

10 % alumni
21 % faculty
16 % school administrators
49 % students
16 % union staff.

(NOTE: These recommended percentages are the result of

averaging the questionnaire results for each category. As explained earlier, they should be valid as general guidelines.)

The members of the policy board should be chosen in some manner by the group they represent (56%, item 10.B). The programming board should be composed of:

12 % alumni
18 % faculty
16 % school administrators
61 % students
19 % union staff.

This board, like the policy board, should be established by allowing each group represented to choose its own representatives (52%, item 11.B.).

GUIDELINE 7. Union-sponsored programs should be physically carried out by a combination of paid student employees, student volunteers and union staff; emphasis should be on the latter two groups (73%, item 12).

GUIDELINE 8.A. The most appropriate sources of operating funds for the union are as follows:

1) student "activity" fees (92%, item 13);
2) revenues from union facilities such as games, food service, book store and miscellaneous sales (88%, item 13); and
3) revenues from paid admission programs (69%, item 13).

8.B. Similarly, the recommended sources of programming funds should be:

1) Student "activity" fees (100%, item 14);
2) revenues from paid admission programs (86%, item 14); and
3) revenues from union facilities such as games, food service, book store, and miscellaneous sales (71%, item 14).

8.C. As a beginning policy (for a new union) at the regional campuses, a fair student assessment would be under $15 per semester per student, as the source for student "activity" fees (81%, item 15). Ten to fifteen dollars seems to be the best range (48%, item 15).

GUIDELINE 9.A. Students should be involved in planning the union programming budget through joint cooperation of the programming and policy-making boards (61%, item 16).

The emphasis should be on the programming board (29%, item 16).

9.B. The union programming budget request should be approved by the union director, after being reviewed by the programming and policy boards. (NOTE: Item 17 concerned who should approve the union programming budget before it is sent to the final approval authority for the institution. The results were difficult to evaluate. Although 47% suggested means other than the given choices, there was no specific majority within these suggestions. Nine involved c (the union director) as part of a combination. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents chose c alone. This seems to indicate that the union director was the most popular choice of the experts, preferably alone but possibly in combination with the programming and/or policy board. This is the rationale for guideline 9.B., above.)

9.C. Programming expenditures during the year (which have been budgeted in advance) should be approved by the union director (37%, item 18) after being requested by the programming board (part of the 47%, item 18). (NOTE: This guideline is based on similar data for item 18 as discussed in the note above for item 17.)

II. Facilities:

GUIDELINE 1.A. Separate union buildings, if possible, should be built on most of the regional campuses (82%, item 1).

1.B. If a separate building is not possible, union facilities should be located in practically any building possible except a faculty office building (see previous discussion of item 2 under Findings).

(NOTE: A recommendation based on responses to item 2 is difficult, since no real preference was shown by the panel. The responses written in for "other", although comprising 38% of the total, were varied with no one building receiving a majority preference.)

GUIDELINE 2.A. (NOTE: Guidelines 2 through 5, except where otherwise stated, are based on ratings of 3 by 51% or more of the experts.)

Facilities which are recommended as a necessity in the regional campus union building are as follows: (item 4)

1) bookstore (76%)
2) campus shop (paper, pencils, stationery, etc.) (69%)
3) dining hall (cafeteria) (71%)
4) general lounge (82%)
5) general meeting rooms (71%)

6) general organizational offices (51%)
7) information desk or center (69%)
8) recreation room(s) or gameroom(s) -- billiards, cards, etc. (61%)
9) snack bar (sandwiches, etc.) (80%)
10) student government office (65%)
11) student newspaper office (51%)
12) union committee offices (55%)
13) union staff offices (90%)
14) vending machine area (51%)

2.B. Those facilities which are not advisable for the type of union in the present study are listed below (based on choices in item 4 omitted by 51% or more of the experts):

1) post office (53%)
2) school administrative offices other than union ones (59%)

GUIDELINE 3.A. It is not considered necessary that the union provide any of the predominantly outdoor facilities listed in item 5 of the questionnaire. However, an auditorium is a <u>desirable</u> union facility (63% rated this as <u>2</u> -- desirable -- or above).

3.B. It is <u>not advisable</u> that the union provide the following facilities (based on omissions in item 5):

1) archery range (53%)
2) camping facilities (78%)
3) carpet golf course (59%)
4) golf course (regulation) (76%)
5) golf driving range (65%)
6) gymnasium (51%)
7) picnic facilities (57%)
8) pistol or rifle range (82%)
9) riding stables (84%).

GUIDELINE 4.A. A gameroom or recreation room should be provided in the union building at each regional campus (92%, item 6).

Facilities and equipment that should be considered a necessity in the gamerooms are:

1) billiards (53%)
2) cards (69%)
3) checkers (65%)
4) chess (63%)
5) table tennis (61%).

4.B. Machine games ("pin ball," etc.) are not advisable as gameroom facilities (67%, item 6).

GUIDELINE 5. A recreational craft shop is not advisable for the regional campuses (59%, item 7).

GUIDELINE 6. Faculty and administration should be encouraged to use certain union facilities (96%, item 8.A.).

GUIDELINE 7. Non-student residents or groups from the outside community should be encouraged to use certain union facilities when not being used by the campus (78%, item 8.B.).

GUIDELINE 8. Outside community facilities such as auditoriums, recreational facilities, cultural facilities, etc. should be utilized by the union rather than having the union duplicate these facilities on campus (59%, item 9).

GUIDELINE 9. Simple modification of existing buildings in good condition in order to house college union facilities would be satisfactory, as opposed to construction of new union facilities (73%, item 10).

GUIDELINE 10.A. Student employees should be used in the union building at places such as gameroom, information desk, etc. (98%, item 11.A.).

11.B. The most appropriate sources for student pay in union facilities are:

1) an earmarked section of the general union budget (82%, item 11.B.)
2) federal programs such as "work study" (73%, item 11.B.)

GUIDELINE 11.A. The parking facilities for the campus should be centered near the union building (88%, item 12.A.).

11.B. The recommendation should be made to the school that the parking centered near the union building be free to students (80%, item 12.B.).

Recommendations

The investigator has repeatedly cautioned that the guidelines developed in the present paper are not to be relied upon as undisputable. They should be useful as general information to be seriously considered by the planners for the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina. Each institution has its own peculiarities, which of course should be studied thoroughly before establishment of a college union is begun. The present guidelines are, however, based on the majority opinions of a carefully selected panel of experts in the college union field. These experts are especially familiar with the problems and advantages of unions on two-year college campuses. Their opinions should be respected.

Although the basic information was developed specifically for the two-year campuses of the University of South Carolina, it may be helpful to other two-year colleges which are similar to the subject campuses. The applicability of the guidelines to these other institutions must be verified by study of local conditions.

As stated in the chapter on review of the literature, research in the area of college union organization and/or facilities is sparse. This is a relatively new field for study, and one not easily subject to controlled research. Each institution has its own environment, and recommendations for one school may not be advisable for another. But some standards must be set, some basics clarified, and some order brought to a growing professional field.

Literature is available outlining the rapid growth in the number of two-year colleges in the United States. Studies have been done which emphasize the differences between two-year and four-year institutions. And abundant studies have been published concerning unions at four-year colleges. Research only needs to be carried out which links the foregoing knowledge together, so that more can be known about the application of present college union philosophy to the two-year college environment.

It is not so much the philosophy as the application of it that should be studied. Something so subjective as proving that a certain philosophy is correct would be difficult to achieve; but there are surely right and wrong ways of doing things. Not only can proper procedures for setting up two-year college unions be outlined, but similar procedures can be established for the operation of such unions, and for proper types of programming, staffing, training, or equipping the two-year college union.

Guidelines such as those suggested above could be established by a variety of means. Perhaps it could be done by a study of current practices among successful two-year unions; perhaps by an analysis of the characteristics of unsuccessful two-year union operations; or by

a survey of union equipment, facilities, types of programs, or staffing practices at two-year institutions.

The investigator recommends, then, that further research be carried out for at least two purposes: 1) to learn about practices and procedures of existing two-year college unions; and 2) to link knowledge of present college union philosophy to the two-year college environment.

Such studies could be useful even to student personnel workers already familiar with unions at four-year institutions. Certainly proper guidelines would be of great value to all persons responsible for the welfare of a new and growing breed of student -- the two-year small college commuter.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTERS AND QUESTIONNAIRE, WITH STATISTICAL RESULTS

July 19, 1968

Dear

It will be appreciated if you can assist Arthur B. Hartzog, one of our graduate students in Student Personnel Services, in the research project which is explained in his letter.

A summary of the results will be made available to those desiring it.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Witten
Vice President

July 20, 1968

Dear

The attached questionnaire is to be the basis of a study for my Master's Paper, the subject of which is to establish guidelines for college union organization and facilities on the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina. Your help in responding to the items would be a great help to me.

These eight "extensions" of the University have many of the characteristics of a community college; and although this study deals specifically with these particular campuses, the results may be of benefit to many community colleges.

The questionnaire is being sent to a number of people who have distinguished themselves in student personnel work. The majority of these are union directors or directors of student activities at two-year community colleges. Others are deans and student personnel educators at two-year and four-year colleges. The responses of this "panel of experts" will be analyzed, and conclusions drawn in the form of guidelines for student personnel planners at the regional campuses of the University of South Carolina. The guidelines of course will be rather general, since specific planning will depend on local situations.

Your responses to the questionnaire will be important to the balance I am seeking in the categories of experts who respond. It is perhaps a seemingly difficult task to respond to specific questions about institutions with which you are not familiar. Most of the items, however, call for simple professional judgments which have obvious implications. A general description of the regional campuses is given on the first page of the questionnaire.

Upon request, you will be furnished a summary of the results. If you could return the completed questionnaire by August 10, 1968 it will help assure the success of what several members of the Association of College Unions - International, officials of the University of South Carolina, and other student personnel workers feel is an important study.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Arthur B. Hartzog
Graduate Assistant
Student Union

This questionnaire has been cleared by the Association of College Unions Research Committee for distribution. Your cooperation in providing data will be appreciated.

PLEASE RETURN BY AUGUST 10, 1968

Following is a brief description of the two-year "regional" campuses of the University of South Carolina. Please have this description clearly in mind before responding to the items.

---

a) Two-year regional campuses (or "extensions") of the University of South Carolina, which is a state university with about 10,000 students on its main campus;

b) the regional campuses are administered through the Provost of the University (who is also the Senior Vice-President of the University), with a resident director at each campus;

c) an average enrollment on each regional campus of about 240 students during fall and spring terms, all of whom live off campus;

d) programs provide for college transfer, terminal vocational and technical training, and adult education; ("c" and "d" placing these regional campuses in the generally accepted category of "community colleges");

e) located in suburban or small municipal areas (except for one -- the newest -- campus, which is in a larger city); most within 135 miles of the main campus;

f) as some indication of social class of students, their family incomes generally fall in the range of $6,000 to $15,000 annually;

g) established campuses five years old or older, utilizing some previously existing buildings, but with some new buildings;

h) predicted increases in enrollment over next five to ten years up to an average of 750 students per institution; room for moderate expansion;

i) classes begin at 8:00 A.M., afternoon labs and classes, and some night classes - five days a week;

j) existing "student council" (student government) on all campuses;

k) no college union organization or facilities now exist on any of these campuses, although one "student center" building does exist;

l) tuition fees per semester for each student are $227.

PLEASE READ ALL RESPONSES BEFORE RESPONDING TO ITEMS

I. ORGANIZATION:

1. Would an organized college union which provides social, cultural, and recreational programs and facilities be more desirable at this type of institution than the institution simply providing a student center (building) and letting individual organizations or the outside community provide such programs and facilities?

#	%	
38	81	yes
9	19	no
2		omit

(In answering the following questions, assume that unions are being planned for the regional campuses.)

2. At present, the main campus of the University operates a comprehensive college union which has no connection with the regional campuses. In your opinion, should the unions at the regional campuses be operated as "satellites" of the main campus union (i.e., be connected in any way to the main campus union), as opposed to being completely independent of it?

#	%	
29	60	yes
19	40	no
1		omit

3. If you answered "yes" to #2 above, what kind of connection to the main campus union would you recommend? (check one)

#	%		
26	87	a)	as part of a department of college unions, with much autonomy in planning and programming
2	7	b)	as a direct extension of the main campus union, with much of the planning done through the main campus union
2	7	c)	other (explain briefly)_____

4. Should there be a full-time union director (or manager) for each campus (whether "satellite" or not), considering average size and predicted growth?

#	%	
32	65	yes
17	35	no

5. If the answer to #4 is "no", who should the administrator of each regional campus union be? (check one)

#	%		
0	0	a)	director of regional campus
10	56	b)	another administrator or faculty member who devotes part-time to union administration

#	%	
2	11	c) a roving assistant to the main campus union director
6	33	d) other (specify)____

6. If the answer to #4 is "yes", to whom should the regional campus union director be responsible? (check one)

#	%	
2	6	a) director of the main campus union
21	66	b) director of the regional campus
9	8	c) other (specify)_____

(The above item and all following items refer to the "typical" regional campus (in the singular) as described on the first page.)

7. Should the union organization be: (check one)

#	%	
31	63	a) a committee or sub-organization of the local student government
18	37	b) independent of other local campus organizations

8. The chief student officer of the union should be: (check one)

#	%	
1	3	a) appointed by the outgoing chief student officer
2	4	b) appointed by the union director
15	31	c) elected by the student body
17	35	d) selected by a committee (specify type)_____
11	23	e) selected by an outgoing union board (specify type of board)_____
2	4	f) there should be no such officer
1	omit	

9. The union organization on the regional campuses should consist of: (check one)

#	%	
1	2	a) a policy-making board
10	20	b) a programming board
38	78	c) both of the above
0	0	d) neither of the above

10.A. If a policy board was recommended in #9 above. indicate in the blanks below the approximate percentage of each category who should make up the policy board for the union: (omit those who should not be on the board)

Average %	
10	a) alumni
21	b) faculty
16	c) school administrators
49	d) students
16	e) union staff
0	f) other (specify)_____

10.B. How should this policy-making board usually be obtained? (check one)

#	%	
2	5	a) appointed by the new or outgoing chief student officer
1	3	b) appointed by the union director
5	13	c) appointed by a school official other than the union director
6	15	d) elected by the student body
3	8	e) selected by the outgoing policy board
22	56	f) other means (specify)_____
10	omit	_____

11.A. If a programming board was recommended in question #9 above, indicate in the blanks below the approximate percentage of each category who should make up the programming board or committee: (omit those who should not be on the board)

Average	%	
12		a) alumni
18		b) faculty
16		c) school administrators
61		d) students
19		e) union staff
5		f) other (specify)_____
		_____

B. How should this programming board usually be obtained? (check one)

#	%	
3	7	a) appointed by the new or outgoing chief student officer
2	5	b) appointed by the union director
6	14	c) appointed by a school official other than the union director
4	10	d) elected by the student body
5	12	e) selected by the outgoing policy board
22	52	f) other means (specify)_____
7	omit	_____

12. Who should physically carry out union-sponsored programs (i.e., setting up of facilities, distributing publicity, etc.)? (check as many as apply)

#	%	
5	10	a) paid student employees
1	3	b) student volunteers
3	6	c) union staff
35	73	d) some combination of above (specify letters)_____
4	8	e) other (specify)_____
1	omit	

13. Check as many of the following which seem to you an appropriate source of <u>operating</u> funds for the union: (check as many as apply)

#	%	
17	35	a) private
34	69	b) revenues from paid admission programs

#	%		
43	88	c)	revenues from union facilities such as games, food service, book store, miscellaneous sales
26	53	d)	state appropriations
45	92	e)	student "activity" fees
9	18	f)	other (specify)_____

14. Check as many of the following which seem to you an appropriate source of programming funds for the union: (check as many as apply)

#	%		
24	49	a)	private gifts
42	86	b)	revenues from paid admission programs
35	71	c)	revenues from union facilities such as games, food service, book store, miscellaneous sales
18	37	d)	state appropriations
49	100	e)	student "activity" fees
4	4	f)	other (specify)_____

15. If student "activity" fees are to be used as the major source for programming and/or operating funds, what would be a fair student assessment per semester, as a beginning policy? (Keep in mind that tuition is $227 per semester.)

#	%		
15	33	a)	under $10 per semester
22	48	b)	$10 - $15 per semester
9	19	c)	$15 - $20 per semester
0	0	d)	over $20 per semester
3	omit		

16. Should students be involved in planning the union programming budget through: (check as many as apply)

#	%		
3	6	a)	the policy-making board
14	29	b)	the programming board
30	61	c)	other (specify)_____
2	4	d)	students should not be involved in planning the budget

17. Who should approve the union programming budget request before it is sent to the final approval authority for the institution? (check one)

#	%		
7	14	a)	the policy-making board
5	10	b)	the programming board
14	29	c)	the union director
23	47	d)	other (specify)_____

18. Who should approve programming expenditures during the year (which have been budgeted in advance) for the union? (check as many as apply)

#	%		
1	2	a)	the chief student officer of the union
0	0	b)	the policy-making board
7	14	c)	the programming board
18	37	d)	the union director
23	47	e)	other (specify)_____

COMMENTS ON ANY OF THE QUESTIONS CONCERNING UNION ORGANIZATION:

(PLEASE READ ALL RESPONSES BEFORE RESPONDING TO ITEMS)

II. FACILITIES:

1. From the description of the institutions, do you think that a separate union building should be built on each (or most) campus(es)?

#	%	
40	82	yes
9	18	no

2. If a separate building is not possible, where should union facilities be located? (check one)

#	%		
9	20	a)	an administration building
10	22	b)	a classroom building
3	7	c)	a faculty office building
6	13	d)	spread out in a combination of the above (specify letters) _____
17	38	e)	other (specify)_____
4	omit		

(Even if you did not recommend a separate union building in question #1 above, assume for the remaining questions that union buildings are being planned for the regional campuses.)

3. What should be the location of the building? (check one)

#	%		
2	4	a)	at edge of campus, away from other buildings
36	75	b)	center of campus
1	3	c)	near administration building(s)
4	8	d)	near classrooms
5	10	e)	location makes no difference for the size campuses described
1	omit		

4. Following is a list of facilities which may be provided in (or connected to) a union building. Disregarding for the moment the element of cost, write a "3" by those which seem to you to be necessary for a union building on these type campuses; a "2" by those which seem to be simply desirable; and a "1" by those which seem to be acceptable for the type of union we are considering; omit those which would not be advisable:*

#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
13	26	10	20	19	39	7	14	a)	art gallery
14	29	8	16	9	18	18	37	b)	ball room
1	2	2	4	9	18	37	76	c)	bookstore
23	47	14	29	10	20	2	4	d)	bowling lanes
5	10	6	12	4	8	34	69	e)	campus shop (paper, pencils, Stationery, etc.)
5	10	5	10	4	8	35	71	f)	dining hall (cafeteria)
1	2	2	4	6	12	40	82	g)	general lounge
3	6	1	2	10	20	35	71	h)	general meeting rooms
9	18	3	6	12	24	25	51	i)	general organizational offices
6	12	6	12	3	6	34	69	j)	information desk or center
7	14	8	16	19	39	15	31	k)	lockers for books, coats, etc.
10	20	6	12	19	39	14	29	l)	large assembly room
26	53	10	20	9	18	4	8	m)	post office (remember all students commute)
11	22	8	16	22	45	8	16	n)	patio
21	43	16	33	9	18	3	6	o)	outdoor theater or stage
5	10	0	0	14	29	30	61	p)	recreation room(s) or gameroom(s) (billiards, cards, etc.)
29	59	10	20	4	8	6	12	q)	school administrative offices other than union ones (specify) _____
3	6	1	2	6	12	39	80	r)	snack bar (sandwiches, etc.)
11	22	10	20	19	39	9	18	s)	special lounge(s) (Music listening, etc)
4	8	4	8	9	18	32	65	t)	student government office
7	14	5	10	13	26	25	51	u)	student newspaper office
14	29	4	8	14	29	17	35	v)	study lounge(s)
23	47	16	33	6	12	4	8	w)	swimming pool
23	47	10	20	12	24	4	8	x)	theater
10	20	6	12	19	39	14	29	y)	T.V. lounge
12	24	3	6	7	14	27	55	z)	union committee offices
2	4	0	0	3	6	44	90	a+)	union staff offices
4	8	8	16	12	24	25	51	b+)	vending machine area
23	47	15	31	9	18	2	4	c+)	woodcraft and/or ceramics shop
12	24	7	14	16	33	14	29	d+)	yearbook office
4	8	1	2	2	4	4	8	e+)	other (specify)_____

*The Columns of results for questions 4, 5, 6, and 7, on this and the following page represent, from left to right, ratings of omit, 1, 2, and 3.

5. None of the following facilities are provided on any of the regional campuses, and no physical education is offered on any of the campuses. Please rate, as in question #4 above, the following items (i.e., "3" if it is necessary that the union provide the facility, "2" if it is desirable, "1" if acceptable, and omit if not advisable that the union provide it):

#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
26	53	13	26	9	18	1	2	a)	archery range
9	18	9	18	8	16	23	47	b)	auditorium
38	78	8	16	3	6	0	0	c)	camping facilities
29	59	12	24	7	14	1	2	d)	carpet golf course
37	76	9	18	3	6	0	0	e)	golf course (regulation)
32	65	11	22	4	8	2	4	f)	golf driving range
21	43	6	12	16	33	6	12	g)	handball court
24	49	10	20	11	22	4	8	h)	horseshoe pits
25	51	4	8	4	8	16	33	i)	gymnasium
24	49	6	12	15	31	4	8	j)	outdoor basketball court(s)
28	57	7	14	8	16	6	12	k)	picnic facilities
40	82	7	14	2	4	0	0	l)	pistol or rifle range
41	84	7	14	1	2	0	0	m)	riding stables
21	43	7	14	12	24	9	18	n)	softball and/or football field(s)
22	45	4	8	13	26	10	20	o)	tennis court

6. Please rate, as in the above two questions, the following facilities which you feel should be provided in a gameroom or recreation room at these campuses:

#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
45	92	2	4	0	0	2	4	a)	gameroom should not be provided
6	12	1	2	16	33	26	53	b)	billiards
24	49	10	20	12	24	3	6	c)	bowling
5	10	1	2	9	18	34	69	d)	cards
6	12	0	0	11	22	32	65	e)	checkers
8	16	0	0	10	20	31	63	f)	chess
33	67	7	14	6	12	3	6	g)	machine games ("pin ball," etc.)
21	43	4	8	20	41	4	8	h)	shuffleboard (floor or table)
6	12	1	2	12	24	30	61	i)	table tennis
47	96	0	0	1	2	1	2	j)	other (specify)_____

7. Please rate, as in the above three questions, the following facilities which you feel should be provided in a recreational craft shop on the campuses described:

#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
29	59	2	4	1	2	17	35	a)	craft shop should not be provided
39	80	5	10	3	6	2	4	b)	automotive
27	55	0	0	8	16	14	29	c)	ceramics
38	78	2	4	7	14	2	4	d)	electronics
35	71	2	4	5	10	7	14	e)	lapidary
33	67	0	0	11	22	5	10	f)	metal craft
26	53	1	2	5	10	17	35	g)	photography
33	67	1	2	7	14	8	16	h)	picture matting or framing
29	59	1	2	9	18	10	20	i)	woodwork
23	33	0	0	0	0	1	2	j)	other (specify)_____

8.A. Should faculty and administration be encouraged to use certain union facilities?

#	%	
47	96	yes
2	4	no

B. Should non-student residents or groups from the outside community be encouraged to use certain union facilities when not being used by the campus?

#	%	
38	78	yes
41	19	no
3		omit

9. Should outside community facilities such as auditoriums, recreational facilities, cultural facilities, etc. be utilized by the union rather than having the union duplicate these facilities on campus?

#	%	
27	59	yes
19	41	no
3		omit

10. To the best of your judgment, would the simple modification (not extensive remodeling) of old buildings to house college union facilities be satisfactory, as opposed to construction of new union facilities? (This is necessarily a general question, since you have no knowledge of existing buildings on the regional campuses. Assume that the old buildings are in good condition.)

#	%	
36	73	yes
13	26	no

11.A. Should student employees be used in the union building at places such as gameroom, information desk, etc.?

#	%	
48	98	yes
1	2	no

B. Check the appropriate source for student pay in the union facility: (check as many as you recommend)

#	%		
40	82	a)	an earmarked section of the general union budget
36	73	b)	federal programs such as "work-study"
15	31	c)	generally from the budget as needed
8	16	d)	some institutional budget other than the college union one
0	0	e)	other (specify)_____

12.A. Should the parking facilities for the campus be centered near the union building?

#	%	
42	88	yes
6	12	no
1	omit	

B. If you answered "yes" above, would you recommend that the school make the parking free to students?

#	%	
33	80	yes
8	20	no
8	omit	

COMMENTS ON ANY OF THE QUESTIONS CONCERNING UNION FACILITIES:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP. PLEASE FILL IN THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

NAME_____

TITLE_____

BUSINESS ADDRESS_____

_____

_____ZIP CODE_____

CHECK HERE IF YOU WOULD LIKE A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY:_____

PLEASE RETURN THIS COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED, BY AUGUST 10, 1968, OR EARLIER IF POSSIBLE.

APPENDIX B

LIST OF RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

LIST OF RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

I. GENERAL

Jane Matson
Director, Student Personnel
Project
American Association of
Junior Colleges
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Herb Reinhard
Dean of Men
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Carl G. Winter
Consultant, California
Community Colleges
Bureau of General
Education
Sacramento, California

Thomas F. Haenle, Chairman
ACU-I Committee on Junior Colleges
State University of New York
at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Dale Brostrom
Chairman, ACU-I Recreation
Committee
Director, Chicago Circle Center
University of Illinois
Chicago, Illinois

Chester A. Berry
Executive Secretary, ACU-I
Stanford, California

Dr. Eugene W. Schoch
Consultant, Student Personnel
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida

Porter Butts
Editor of Publications, ACU-I
Director, Wisconsin Union
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Duane E. Lake
Director, University Center
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

II. STUDENT PERSONNEL EDUCATORS

Dr. Collins Burnette
Chairman, Department of
Higher & Adult Education
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

R. E. Prusok
Director, Student Personnel
Grad. Studies
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

Dr. Terry O'Banion
College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Dr. Kate H. Mueller
Professor of Higher Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Dr. E. L. Tolbert, Associate
Professor
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Dr. Theodore K. Miller
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Dr. David V. Teideman, Professor
Harvard Graduate School of
Education
Cambridge, Mass.

Dr. Wesley A. Davis
Towson State College
Psychology Department
Towson, Maryland

APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

III. TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PERSONNEL

Walter E. Evans
Director of Student Activities
Cuyahoga Community College
Western Campus
Cleveland, Ohio

Dr. Dixie J. Allen
Dean of Student Personnel
Lake Sumter Junior College
Leesburg, Florida

Mrs. Jane Gentry Smith
Director, El Centro Student Center
El Centro College
Dallas, Texas

Mr. Al Lowe
Director, Student Personnel
Chipola Junior College
Chipley, Florida

Mrs. Robert R. Pedlow, Jr.
Acting Director, Student Union
Lake City Junior College and Forest Ranger School
Lake City, Florida

Albert L. Marsh
Director, Student Activities
St. Petersburg Junior College
St. Petersburg, Florida

Robert V. Denson
Coordinator, Student Activities
Manatee Junior College
Bradenton, Florida

Paul J. Glynn
Dean, Student Personnel
Palm Beach Junior College
Lake Worth, Florida

Dr. William Kerr
Director of Student Activities
Central Florida Junior College
Ocala, Florida

Mr. Allen Saval
Director of Student Activities
North Shore Community College
Beverly, Mass.

Dr. Henry Williams
Dean of Men
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida

Mr. Eugene Guswiler
Dean of Student Services
Macomb County Community College
Warren, Michigan

William Hillard
Asst. Director of Student Activities
Miami-Dade Junior College
Miami, Florida

Mr. Stephen A. Violante
Director, Isaac K. Beckes Student Union
Vincennes University
Vincennes, Indiana

APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PERSONNEL

C. Weston Hatch
Director, Student Union
North Idaho Junior College
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

A. Paul Thompson
Director of Student Affairs
Chowan College
Murfreesboro, North Carolina

Doris-Gale Crownover
Dean of Students
Amarillo College
Amarillo, Texas

Kenneth Sanford
Dean of Men
Gardner-Webb College
Boiling Springs, North Carolina

Mr. Eldon Long
Director, Student Personnel
Del Max College
Corpus Christi, Texas

Ralph Williams
Director of Student Affairs
Wingate College
Wingate, North Carolina

Jerome F. Weynand
Dean of Student Affairs
San Antonio College
San Antonio, Texas

Sharon L. Briggs
Assistant to Dean of Students
Cazenovia College
Cazenovia, New York

James B. Furrh
Dean of Student Life
San Jacinto College
Pasadena, Texas

Jerry F. Howard
Dean of Men & Director of
Financial Aid
Keystone Junior College
La Plume, Pennsylvania

William H. Spelman, III
Coordinator, Campus Activities
Union Director
S.U.N.Y. at Alfred
Alfred, New York

David A.Reynolds
Dean of Student Affairs
McKeesport Campus
Penn. State University
McKeesport, Pennsylvania

J. Braxton Harris
Asst. Director
Division of Teacher Education
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina

Claude L. Gates, Jr.
Dean of Student Personnel
Community College of Del. Co.
Folsom, Pennsylvania

APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PERSONNEL

James Harvey
Dean of Students
Harper College
Elk Grove, Illinois

Donald Swank
Director, Student Personnel
Services
Parkland College
Champaign, Illinois

Ross L. Handy
Admin. Asst.
Citrus College
Azusa, California

Marjorie L. Hinson
Asst. Dean of Students Activities
De Anza College
Cupertino, California

Leslie G. Knoles
Asst. Supt.
Yosemite Junior College District
Modesto, California

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. CONDON, JOHN T. Student unions and the community college. College Unions -- 1967: Proceedings of Forty-fourth Annual Conference. Philadelphia, Penn.: Association of College Unions-International, 1967, pp. 74-77.

2. ORCUTT, JOHN N. Staffing the junior college union. College Unions--1967: Proceedings of Forty-fourth Annual Conference. Philadelphia, Penn.: Association of College Unions - International, 1967, p. 197.

3. HARPER, WILLIAM A. (ed.). Directory, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968, p. 57.

4. Notice listing areas of recommended research, posted by the Research Committee, Association of College Unions - International, 1967.

5. CHRISTENSEN, ERNEST MARTIN. An Annotated Bibliography of the College Union. (College Unions at Work Series). Ithaca, N.Y.: Association of College Unions - International, 1967, pp. 221-222.

6. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES. Junior Colleges: An Introduction. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963

7. REINHARD, HERB F. The union is the center. Junior College Journal, 1967, 37 (May), pp. 29-30.

8. LYONS, JAMES W. A study of the administrative responsibilities, work environment, experience and recommended curricular preparation of a college union director. Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, Indiana University, 1963, cited by Reinhard, Herb F., The Role of the Campus Union in the American Two-year College as Perceived by the Student Personnel Administrators. Indiana University, June, 1965.

9. U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. Enrollment and Facilities of New Colleges and Universities Opening Between 1961 and 1965. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964 (mim.).

10. HUMPHREYS, J. ANTHONY. Two improved programs of student personnel services. Junior College Journal, March, 1952.

11. Report of the Junior College Committee. College Unions -- 1967: Proceedings of Forty-fourth Annual Conference. Philadelphia, Penn.: Association of College Unions - International, 1967, p. 265.

12. ZISSIS, CECILIA. Changes in activities programs. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1967, 30 (Summer), pp. 164-166.

13. MEDSKER, LELAND L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

14. NELSON, PATRICIA. The commuter -- an intriguing phenomenon. Proceedings of Forty-third Annual Conference. Association of College Unions - International, 1966, pp. 134-136.

15. REINHARD, HERB F. The Role of the Campus Union in the American Two-Year College as Perceived by the Student Personnel Administrators. Indiana University, June, 1965.

16. CIAMPI, MARIO, HUBER, C. FREDERICK AND SCHEIDER, RAYMOND C. Creative planning: the student center. New Dimensions in Junior College Planning. Stanford University: School Planning Laboratory, 1958.

17. REEVE, J. THOMAS. The commuter -- an intriguing phenomenon. Proceedings of Forty-third Annual Conference. Association of College Unions-International, 1966, pp. 136-141.

18. MURPHY, JAMES T. A survey of facilities, programs, services, and the directorship of New York State community college student centers. Unpublished paper, N. Y. University, N. Y., January 10, 1964.

19. COLLLINS, CHARLES C. Premises: Planning Student Personnel Facilities. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

20. Planning the community college. College and University Business, Vol. 43, No. 4, October, 1967, pp. 57-72.

21. BUTTS, PORTER. The college union story. A. I. A. Journal, March, 1964, pp. 59-66.